



RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2635

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 09/880,779

Confirmation No.: 7857

In re Application of:

Christophe VINCENT et al.

Group Art Unit: 2635

Filed: June 15, 2001

Examiner: Matsuichiro Shimizu

For: ACCESS SYSTEM TO AN ITEM OF AUTOMATIC CONTROL
EQUIPMENT VIA A WIRELESS PROXIMITY NETWORK

CONFIRMATION OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW AND
REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants confirm the December 23, 2004 telephone interview, discussed in detail below, between the Examiner and request entry of the Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116 filed October 19, 2004 for the reasons herein. The telephone interview was held after receipt of the Advisory action mailed

Serial No.: 09/880,779

December 17, 2004. The instant paper reduces to writing what was said during the interview. The remarks further amplify the arguments for patentability presented in the Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116 and provide basis why applicants disagree with the statement in the Advisory Action that the claims are not patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner was informed during the interview that the requested claim changes were merely edits for clarity and the Amendment should readily be entered. It was further stated that the Examiner, in the Advisory Action, erroneously attributed applicants' argument regarding "the initial RF signal "wakes up" as part of an explanation of functionality of applicants' claimed invention. That argument, in contrast, was a brief description of a function of the Gastouniotis et al. '329 system. It was explained that applicants' claims recite the link mechanism being present in each type of automatic control equipment; therefore, any specific equipment can be either a "server" or a "client" depending on circumstances. It was explained that Gastouniotis et al. '329 discloses instrument